

School of  
Architecture and  
Allied Arts c. early  
1950s. Photo cour-  
tesy University of  
Oregon Archives.

The final article brings the issue back to the Partnership conference, where Lee Roth delivered a lecture about Native American architecture. His intention was that conference attendees might gain some understanding about Native American ideas regarding their cultural resources and be able to form more effective partnerships based on mutual understanding and respect. That is a very worthy goal for us all—one that the interdisciplinary program in Historic Preservation at the University of Oregon strives to implement and use as the basis for contributing to the community while learning to practice as members of the larger community.

*Matt Meacham is a graduate student in Historic Preservation at the School of Architecture and Allied Arts, University of Oregon, and also holds a Master's Degree in Architecture from that School.*

*Donald Peting, Associate Dean of the School of Architecture and Allied Arts, is Director of the Historic Preservation Program and a preservation architect.*



*Matt and Don served as guest editors for this special University issue of CRM. The guest editors wish to thank Ron Greenberg for the privilege and honor of serving as guest editors, and acknowledge Bill Freeman for his excellent technical support. In addition to the student authors, this issue owes much to: Nicole Sabourin, Magdalen Trebbien and Amanda Welsh, undergraduates in Historic Preservation; Erin Hanafin Berg, Karin Link, Chris Ottaway, and Suzanne SanRomani, graduate students; and Julie Foster and Liza Kazebee, administrative assistants.*

Henry C. Kunowski

## Soupstones, Nails, and Boiled Axe

In July of last year, during a week of perfect Oregon weather, representatives from a dozen federal and state agencies, and Indian Tribes gathered to discuss the future of cultural resource management in the region. Billed as a “first of its kind,” the *Pacific Northwest Conference - Forging Preservation Partnerships: Principles and Practice* sprang from a growing interest in the recent successes of creating a unique stew of interorganizational training and development partnerships. These partnerships also grew from several mutu-

al interests and constraints—primarily a shared mission to protect cultural resources and diminishing funding and staff reductions. By combining limited funds and professional staff, training, education, and resource protection could be accomplished. As Roger Kennedy, Director of the National Park Service, succinctly stated during his conference keynote address, “We either hang together, or we will hang separately.”

The catalyst and funding for the conference came from the National Park Service’s Cultural Resource Training Initiative. In addition to the

NPS, principal sponsors were the Pacific Northwest Region of the USDA Forest Service, the University of Oregon School of Architecture and Allied Arts, the Bureau of Land Management, and the Oregon Parks and Recreation Department-State Historic Preservation Office. Additional sponsorship came from the Confederated Tribes of the Warm Springs Reservation, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Oregon Department of Transportation, Bureau of Indian Affairs, and the National Trust for Historic Preservation.

As stated in numerous previous resource management articles on partnerships, the concept of partnerships is not new, but has been rediscovered over the last few years. A broad overview of the subject written by Ervin H. Zube appeared in *CRM* Vol. 15, No. 8, 1992. Ron Greenberg served as editor of the conference proceedings for the 1991 Albany, New York conference, *Partnerships in Parks and Preservation*. Four years after this and other conferences and articles on partnerships, can we lay the "P" word to rest? Let's see.

From his observations of the Albany conference, and my own recent experience with the Portland, Oregon conference, I agree with Mr. Zube's statement that characterizes partnerships as including "...common visions and goals, trust and harmony, and shared ownership. Effective communication and cooperation are essential." These elements make up the basic ingredients and are common to any successful partnership. However, all partnerships are unique and require their own mix and proportions of ingredients, and yes, some partnerships fail. For those looking for a cook book or case study approach to the subject, stop here, because none will be offered. Most if not all articles on the topic deal with project-specific partnerships, and since all are unique, there is more to learn from their common principles than from specific cases. The intent of this article is to discuss creating cultural resource program partnerships. To better understand the concept of partnerships, it is useful to start with a few basic ingredients from folklore: soupstones, nails, and boiled axe.

*"Surely you have enough grouts to make some Kasha for me.... No, I don't have anything in the house with which to make it.... Give me an axe, and I'll show you how to make Kasha."* And so begins the tale of making something from nothing in Baba Yaga's Geese and Other Russian Stories. The tale is told a hundred different ways as it moves from culture to culture. Sometimes this alchemy involves an axe, as in this tale, or nails, but most often it is stones. The tale can involve a few individuals, or it may include an entire town. The end result is always the same, a lavish feast created from apparently nothing but a few stones

is shared by all. One of the common themes that run through all of these stories is the perception that there is nothing or little in the house or village to share, but when one unexpected ingredient appears, it is followed by several more. In the village scenario members of the community bring their own unique contribution to the stew. *"It's a wonderful soup the farmer said, it's a wonderful soup the farmer's wife said...It is, and it will make soup forever if you follow the formula we used...."* For cultural resource managers the same basic partnership alchemy can be effective in achieving agency mission objectives.

Public agencies may have a little more difficulty contributing to a community stew when the water comes from the Bureau of Reclamation through a local water district, the kettle is owned by the General Services Administration, the fire wood is brought by the U.S. Forest Service, the cabbage and carrots are regulated by the Department of Agriculture, and the soupstones are under testing by the Food and Drug Administration, while the entire affair is on property regulated by the Bureau of Land Management. As daunting a prospect as this may be, there is a history of public/private actions and policies that do facilitate this type of cooperation.

For public agencies responsible for cultural resource management, partnerships have evolved from park- or site-specific agreements in the late-19th century to public policy as reflected in the Historic Sites Act of 1935. This Act established several broad program areas, including the Historic American Buildings Survey and Historic American Engineering Record (HABS/HAER). It also created the opportunity for direct partnerships with non-federal agencies. Section 2e) of the Act states "Contract and make cooperative agreements with States, municipal subdivisions, corporations, associations, or individuals...to protect, preserve, maintain, or operate any historic or archaeological building, site, object...for public use,...." This section of legislation legitimized and institutionalized what many had recognized as good public policy toward the stewardship of significant parks and sites.

While this policy was set in the context of the "New Deal" era of government, it also set the stage for subsequent legislation which would foster the concept that the federal government could achieve broad policy objectives through coordinated planning on a state, regional, or local level. This objective first appeared through the 1959 amendments to the Housing Act of 1954 which provided for intergovernmental planning coordination. Although the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 (NHPA) established the modern foundation for preservation, it also established a proto-

col and procedure to protect cultural resources, but did little to foster program planning and coordination. The next element of federal coordination policy appeared in the Intergovernmental Coordination Act of 1968. The purpose of this Act was to "strengthen State and local government and improve the relations between those governments and the Federal Government [through] closer cooperation and coordination of policies, [and] activities...."

The 1992 amendments to the NHPA changed the way resource preservation-related undertakings are viewed, planned for, and encourage greater trust and cooperation. In part, these amendments also broadened and delegated certain responsibilities to tribal governments, and changed the relationships of key stakeholders responsible for implementing the NHPA. The amendment provided an essential instrument to develop opportunities to evolve the traditional role and relationship the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) has with federal agencies, that of a "permitting" through compliance with Section 106 of the NHPA agency. This opportunity primarily presents itself in the new responsibilities placed on federal agencies in the amendments to Section 110, particularly sub section a)(2) which requires federal agencies to establish a preservation program. In essence, the process is moving from a SHPO site-by-site review of federal undertaking to comment on preliminary determinations of National Register eligibility and levels of effect, to a process where resource protection is planned upfront through a program of identification, evaluation, and protection. As Robert D. Bush, Executive Director of the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (Council), stated in his 1992 letter to federal, state, and tribal preservation officers, "Over the long term, the Council views the requirements for Federal agency preservation programs as an opportunity to better integrate historic preservation planning into agency decision-making." When these new directives are viewed through the perspective of extant intergovernmental cooperation legislation, specifically those related to technical assistance, or "pro-active" mitigation under Section 110(2)(g), partnership opportunities are created.

Whether agencies have direct property stewardship responsibilities, serve as pass-through, or block grant funding sources, these partnerships go beyond the normal Programmatic Agreement (PA) and Memorandum of Agreement (MOA). Since Robert Meinen's appointment in 1992 as Director of Oregon's Parks and Recreation Department, and

State Historic Preservation Officer, the SHPO has been working with its partners to implement several cooperative projects and preservation programs, such as the Pete French Round Barn Rehabilitation, Youth Camp at Silver Falls State Park, Sumpter Gold Dredge State Park, and the light stations at Heceta Head and Cape Blanco. When a region's SHPOs cooperate, this can benefit the operations of a federal agency with multiple states to address. This is the case with the Region 1 U.S. Forest Service MOA between the Idaho and Montana SHPOs, or proposed Oregon and Washington SHPO agreements with various federal agencies such as the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation and Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area, and the South/North Light Rail Corridor. The Oregon Parks and Recreation Department/SHPO is currently discussing several partnerships that include the University of Oregon Preservation Program, U.S. Forest Service, National Park Service, Oregon Historical Society, Certified Local Governments, and other public/private partnerships. The current types of partnership programs and projects include annual historic preservation and cultural resource education and training for staff and students, interpretation programs, internship developmental placement, model PAs, and direct SHPO consultation on a range of undertakings.

All State Historic Preservation Offices are in the process of developing or implementing statewide Historic Preservation Plans. Federal and other governments have an opportunity to create long-term preservation programs that are integrated. The Oregon SHPO is moving in new program directions that are oriented to provide direct consultation in establishing preservation program development and implementation. In the long term, Section 106 compliance might be a secondary consideration if federal agencies are well prepared to meet their Section 110 responsibilities. The Oregon SHPO is working toward participating in the types of relationships that capitalize on opportunities that a diverse and interdisciplinary partnership foster. These kinds of complex ingredients make for a rich and satisfying soup that all members of the community can appreciate and enjoy.

---

*Henry C. Kunowski is on staff with the Oregon State Historic Preservation Office, Parks and Recreation Department. He served as a member of the screening committee and moderator for the 1994 Pacific Northwest Conference on Preservation Partnerships.*